



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,042	08/01/2001	Abraham Karel Riemens	NL 010506	5443

24737 7590 02/25/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

QUILLEN, ALLEN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

10

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/920,042

Applicant(s)

RIEMENS ET AL.

Examiner

Allen E. Quillen

Art Unit

2676

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____



AEQ

MATTHEW C. BELLA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

09/920,042

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the claim language, Reference Taraci et al discloses features of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, Taraci discloses a processor for executing image processing under control of a clock facility (Column 15, lines 1-14), such that a sequence of C effective clock cycles (vertical sync period, Column 14, lines 41-44) will effect a processing operation of a predetermined amount of image information (required total number of pixels per line of output, lines 8-10), said processor being characterized in having a programming means (Column 8, lines 35-45) for implementing programmable stall clock cycles (frame rate delay, Column 8, lines 46-50) interspersed between said effective clock cycles for implementing a programmable slowdown factor S (scaled, Column 10, lines 41-43), such that a modified number of C*S overall clock cycle will effect processing of said predetermined amount of image information (Column 9, lines 8-45). The Applicant strenuously asserts a distinguishment between stall clock cycles and synchronization delay period, and the scope of the Section 103(a) rejections of claims 4, 5, 8. The Applicant argues that reference Taraci's "frame rate delay" is not the same as claimed element "programmable stall clock" (Page 2, 3rd - 4th paragraph; Page 3, lines 1-2). However, the Examiner respectfully replies that, in the instant application, the Applicant uses equivalent language as the prior art terms of "delay" and "synchronization" (synchronization of the time slot level of the processing of an entire field or frame, Page 1, lines 21-22; clock synchronization, Page 4, line 23; lowered data rate; programmable slow down, Page 5, lines 10-12). Furthermore, Applicant asserts secondary references Crump and Kondoh do not disclose programmable stall clock (Page 3, line 5). As indicated above, however, Taraci discloses this feature. The Examiner respectfully notes that resolving these issues will require additional consideration and/or search.